

REMARKS

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action mailed on April 14, 2008. Claims 1-29 are pending in this application.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 10, 21, 25 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(c) as being anticipated by Overhultz et al, (U.S. Patent No. 7,233,241). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The Applicant notes that the present application claimed priority to International Patent Application No. GB2003/005701 (Publication no. WO/2004/061759) on July 7, 2005. International Patent Application No. GB2003/005701 was filed on 12/31/2003 which predates the earliest filing date of the Overhultz reference. In particular, the Overhultz reference claims priority to a US provisional application filed on November 19, 2004 which is nearly a year after the international filing date of GB2003/005701. Thus, Overhultz is not prior art for purposes of 35 USC § 102(c) and the Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Overhultz (U.S. Patent No. 7,233,241). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As stated above, the present application claims priority to International Patent Application GB2003/005701 whose filing date predates the earliest priority date of the Overhultz reference. Consequently, Overhultz is not prior art for purposes of 35 USC § 103(a) and the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 5-9, 11-18, 22-24, and 26-27 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Overhultz (U.S. Patent No. 7,233,241) in view of Silk et al (U.S. Appl. Pub. No. 2004/0233178). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As stated above, the present application claims priority to International Patent Application GB2003/005701 whose filing date predates the earliest priority date of the Overhultz reference. Consequently, Overhultz is not prior art for purposes of 35 USC § 103(a). Nothing in Silk teaches or suggests all the

claimed limitations of claims 5-9, 11-18, 22-24, and 26-27. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Overhultz (U.S. Patent No. 7,233,241) in view of Denne et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,770,988). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As stated above, the present application claims priority to International Patent Application GB2003/005701 whose filing date predates the earliest priority date of the Overhultz reference. Consequently, Overhultz is not prior art for purposes of 35 USC §103(a). Nothing in Denne teaches or suggests all the claimed limitations of claims 19 and 20. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that claims **1-29** are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 502432.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding this application, please contact the undersigned at (612) 332-4720.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 11, 2008

/Scott V. Lundberg/

Scott V. Lundberg

Reg. No. 41,958

Attorneys for Applicant
Fogg and Powers LLC
P.O. Box 581339
Minneapolis, MN 55458-1339
T – (612) 332-4720
F – (612) 332-4731